DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 446 088 SP 039 533

AUTHOR Escobar-Ortloff, Luz Marina; Ortloff, Warren G.
TITLE Differences in Social and Moral Hierarchical Values among American Preservice Teachers and Professors.
PUB DATE 2000-09-30
NOTE 9p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for the Philosophy and History of Education (Biloxi, MS, September 30, 2000).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Moral Values; Preservice Teacher Education; *Social Values; Student Teacher Attitudes; *Student Teachers; Teacher Influence
IDENTIFIERS Colombia

ABSTRACT

This paper shares reflections from a doctoral dissertation that investigated differences in hierarchical values (social and moral) that existed between preservice teacher education students and professors of education in the United States and Colombia. The study used the Rokeach Value Survey instrument to determine students' and faculty members' instrumental (moral) and terminal (social) value hierarchy. The survey consists of 18 terminal and 18 instrumental values. Data analysis indicated that there were statistically significant differences between the two groups. The three instrumental values of clean (neat and tidy), logical (consistent and rational), and loyal (faithful to friends or the group) were significantly different between students and professors. The four terminal values of salvation (being saved/internal life), a sense of accomplishment (lasting contribution), a world at peace (free of war and conflict), and a world of beauty (beauty of nature/arts) were found to be statistically different between professors and students. The authors suggest that students look to their professors not only for instruction, but also for values, so it is important that professors of teacher education model values that society considers important. (Contains 13 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

SP

ED 446 088

DIFFERENCES IN SOCIAL AND MORAL HIERARCHICAL VALUES AMONG AMERICAN PRESERVICE TEACHERS AND PROFESSORS

Luz Marina Escobar-Ortloff, Ph.D.
Department of Foreign Languages and Literature
The University of Southern Mississippi

Warren G. Ortloff, Ed.D.
Department of Educational Leadership and Research
The University of Southern Mississippi

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W.G. Ortloff

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Society for the Philosophy and History of Education in Biloxi, Mississippi on September 30, 2000.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP039533

Introduction

Lickona (1992) writes in his book Educating for Character that "Without ethical training, many teachers tend to treat moral judgement as if it were simply a matter of personal opinion. That is a mistake of moral relativism, an error that has deep roots in contemporary culture" (p.230). Ryan (1988) asserts that schools of education should only recommend those students for teacher certification who are morally literate. Teacher educators should be assured that preservice teachers are receiving through their liberal arts education an understanding of the core ideas underlying Western democracy, ideas such as individual responsibility, social contracts, equality, and inalienable rights. Future teachers must be expected to possess and build upon moral literacy. Teacher educators should not be expected to provide the student moral literacy, but to provide the opportunity to build upon it.

Values education programs in schools usually focus on those values that are universally accepted by almost all cultures and religions. Gibbs and Earley (1994) identified these universal values as (a) compassion, (b) courage, (c) courtesy, (d) fairness, (e) honesty, (f) kindness, (g) loyalty, (h) perseverance, (i) respect, and (j) responsibility. Titus (1997) considered these core values compatible with the democratic values of freedom, equality, justice, and human dignity. Lickona (1993) related that core citizenship values affirm human dignity, promote individual and common good, and protect human rights. The test of reversibility and universality is met and these core values define democratic responsibilities and are recognized as important by all civilized people. Not to teach these values would be a "grave moral failure".

Higher education has not been immune to the crises in values taking place in the United States today. Incidents such as plagiarism, cheating, and abuses in college athletics have increased among students and faculty on college campuses. Since the 1960's, student training in values has either been reduced on college campuses or dropped altogether. College faculties are failing to expose students to values while not becoming involved in the education of personal character. If one accepts the importance of values education, then it would be reasonable to expect those who are charged with the education of our nation's youth, either as a professor or teacher-in-training, to possess sound moral, ethical values and model such behavior. Strategies that have proven to be effective in promoting values acquisition have been teacher modeling, incorporating ethics within the curriculum, and the improvement of academic culture on campus. Beck (1994) submits that the teacher education curriculum must consist not only of academic content and pedagogical methodology, but also an appreciation by the preservice education student of his or her role as a communicator of community and social values.

Shannon (1980-1981) pointed out that the teacher is the common denominator of all the many and varied ideas about morals and values education. Without the teacher's genuine concern and dedication, the best of theories is meaningless. A teacher is constantly and unavoidably moralizing to students. As Purpel and Ryan (1976) explain, "It comes with the territory" (p.5). By a teacher's very action what is important, valuable, and worthwhile is conveyed. McBee (1980) offers the view that not only should ethics be

taught in higher education, but there must be a demonstration of ethical behavior on the teacher' part. Fincher (1980) felt that if values are to be delt with in a substantial way in education then there must be considerable emphasis and concern for values on the part of both students' coursework and in the teachers' classwork, notably teaching.

This paper shares with the reader selected reflections from a doctoral dissertation (Escobar-Ortloff, 1999) that investigated differences in hierarchical values (social and moral) that existed among preservice teacher education students and professors of education in the United States and Colombia. Presented are social and moral values found to be statistically significantly different ($p = < .05$) between university preservice teacher education students and professors at a major teacher training university in the southern part of the United States. Areas of concern are identified as well as implications to teacher education preparation.

Instrumentation

The Rokeach Value Survey instrument was used to determine both the respondents instrumental (moral) and terminal (social) value hierarchy (from the most important to least important relative to all other values). The survey consists of 18 terminal and 18 instrumental values and has been used widely in research since 1967 in over 300 studies worldwide.

Differences in Value Orientation

Moral Values

The instrumental values that were found to be significantly different when comparing students and professors were "clean" (Neat and Tidy), "logical" (Consistent and Rational) and "loyal" (Faithful to Friends or the Group). The instrumental value "clean" was given the high value of 4th by professors while students placed it among their lowest values at 17th. The value is conventional, class-related and associated with socioeconomic status. This placement by both populations was expected because, according to Rokeach (1973), the value increases in importance as one reaches the age of marriage and continues toward greater importance throughout the latter years.

Students assigned great importance to the instrumental value of "loyal" by placing it 4th in their values hierarchy while professors ranked the value 14th. If this high value attributed to students was not significantly influenced by peer pressure, then it could be assumed that these students may also have a relatively high level of trust in people. For professors, the low level of importance might suggest an importance given to personal independence. The instrumental value "logical" was placed high (3rd) by students among their values while professors placed it at 15th. Rokeach (1973) found that this value typically was found in the bottom third of values during adolescence, rises to approximately 12th among college students, then drops in importance for American adults.

Only four terminal values, those of "salvation" (Being saved / internal life), " a sense of accomplishment" (Lasting contribution), " a world at peace" (Free of War and Conflict) and "a world of beauty" (Beauty of Nature/Arts) were found to be statistically different between professors and students. The terminal value "salvation" was among the top six values for students, while professors placed it last among the 18 values presented. This finding represents a change from a 1970's study where Rokeach (1973) found this value increased in importance as one progressed throughout life. One possible explanation is that the majority of students grew up in the southern part of the United States, in an area generally recognized as the "Bible belt". Religion for many has been an influencing factor in their formative years. On the other hand, many professors grew up and went to school in other states where they may or may not have been exposed to a conservative religious tradition.

The terminal value "a sense of accomplishment" was valued 3rd by students while professors placed this value near the bottom of their hierarchy at 17th. Recognized as one of the eight values associated with those who valued education, "a sense of accomplishment" was found by Rokeach (1973) to be more important throughout the college years only to become less important thereafter. This study seems to support this finding.

The placement of the socially oriented terminal values "a world at peace" (Free of War and Conflict) and "a world of beauty" (Beauty of Nature and the Arts) presented statistically significant differences between students and professors. Professors ranked the value "a world at peace" among their highest values at 6th, possibly representing their occupation or concern with world affairs. Students placed this value next to last among their hierarchy affirming the findings by Rokeach (1973) that this value would receive a relatively low ranking for college students while receiving moderate consideration before and after the college years. Both students and professors ranked the terminal value "world of beauty" relatively low; however, professors placed a significantly higher value on "a world of beauty" than did students. Even with all the attention given to ecology and the environment, it appears that this value's importance has not increased over the last 20 years. It must be keep in mind that the Rokeach Value Survey was developed in the 1970's, where the value "a world of beauty" may have been interpreted by students primarily through the concept of beauty and not with the inclusion of ecology and the environment as may be prevalent today.

Instrumental Value Rankings
Comparing Professors and Students

Professors		Students	
Highest Instrumental Values		Highest Instrumental Values	
1.5	Capable	1.0	Self-Controlled
1.5	Helpful	2.0	Independent
3.0	Intellectual	3.0	Logical
4.5	Broad-Minded	4.0	Loyal
4.5	Clean	5.0	Polite
6.0	Polite	6.0	Loving
7.0	Honest	7.0	Imaginative
8.0	Independent	8.0	Helpful
9.0	Forgiving	9.0	Responsible
10.0	Ambitious	10.0	Broad-Minded
11.0	Imaginative	11.0	Intellectual
12.0	Self-Controlled	12.0	Forgiving
13.0	Courageous	13.0	Obedient
14.0	Loyal	14.0	Capable
15.0	Logical	15.0	Ambitious
16.0	Obedient	16.0	Honest
17.0	Loving	17.0	Clean
18.0	Responsible	18.0	Courageous

Terminal Value Rankings
Comparing Professors and Students

Professors		Students	
Highest Terminal Values		Highest Terminal Values	
1.0	Equality	1.0	Equality
2.0	Exciting Life	2.0	Exciting Life
3.0	Mature Love	3.0	Sense of Accomplishment
4.0	Comfortable Life	4.0	True Friendship
5.0	True Friendship	5.0	Salvation
6.0	World of Peace	6.0	Family Security
7.0	Social Recognition	7.0	Freedom
8.0	Pleasure	8.0	Pleasure
9.0	Inner Harmony	9.0	National Security
10.0	Family Security	10.0	Self-Respect
11.0	Wisdom	11.0	Inner Harmony
12.5	Freedom	12.0	Health
12.5	National Security	13.0	Social Recognition
14.0	Health	14.0	Mature Love
15.0	Self-Respect	15.0	Wisdom
16.0	World of Beauty	16.0	Comfortable Life
17.0	Sense of Accomplishment	17.0	World at Peace
18.0	Salvation	18.0	World of Beauty

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Areas of Concern

The Ortloff-Escobar (1999) study brought to the forefront a number of important differences in value hierarchy that when given careful consideration might contribute to better understanding between preservice teacher education students and professors of education. Identified were moral and social values found to be significantly statistically different and well as other value differences that were notable.

Rokeach (1973) identified eight values that he believed were important to those who valued education (Responsible, Broad-Minded, Intellectual, Capable, Sense of Accomplishment, Freedom, Self Respect, Wisdom). Among those, the educational values "sense of accomplishment", "wisdom" and "freedom" were given relatively low order importance in value hierarchy among professors. If professors are not promoting the importance of these values within their students, than an effort should be made to bring those values to a level of high "consciousness" among faculty.
A study by Blumenthal, Kahn, Andrews and Head (1972) found that the majority of adult Americans and college students at that time placed "equality" and "freedom" within the middle third of terminal values. Rokeach interpreted this middle ranking as an ideological orientation characteristic of capitalist countries characterized by relatively low equality and high freedom. The Ortloff-Escobar study found a shift in ideological orientation toward a more socialistic frame of reference where "equality" was ranked first and "freedom" assumed its place among middle values hierarchy for both students and professors.

Other values that deserved attention are "exciting life" "pleasure" and "honest". For both students and professors "exciting life" placed 2nd and "pleasure" 8th among their terminal values. This placement contradicted earlier studies by Rokeach (1968-1971) where he found that these values were ranked at the bottom of national samples. Rokeach suggested that these two hedonistic values were important in adolescence and became progressively less important throughout life. "Pleasure" is associated with the sensory and perceptual experiences of the individual and with "Utilitarism". Winn (1995) wrote "Utilitarism has had a significant effect on America with the support of moral philosophers and sizable portion of the American population. Supported is the belief that in order to live the good life, one must obtain pleasure or happiness and avoid pain. Looking that the results of the Ortloff-Escobar study "Utilitarism among this particular population is alive and well". Among instrumental values of "honest", "responsible" and "capable", "honest" was ranked 7th for professors and nearly last (16th) for students. "Responsible" assumed the last (18th) position for professors and 9th for students, whereas, the value "capable" was 1st with professors and 14th for students.

Conclusion

Thirty years ago, Rokeach (1973) reported that his eight values associated with those who valued education were among the top values selected by college students and professors. The Escobar-Ortloff study (1999) presented quite a different story thirty years later where these same values assumed a much lower hierarchical position. The authors suggest that

this change in value hierarchy may be influenced by a "cultural shift" and the results found at the university in this study may be indicative of a national trend. For example, the value "honest" for students was among their lowest ranked values. University professors might do well to pay special attention to this important character trait. Programs should be developed and implemented that promote the virtue of honesty. Professors should also encourage this value by emulating this virtue and by vigorously enforcing university policies on cheating and plagiarism.

Since the 1960's, student training in values has either been reduced on college campuses or dropped altogether. College faculties are failing to expose students to values while not becoming involved in the education of personal character. If one accepts the importance of values education, then it would be reasonable to expect those who are charged with the education of young people, either as a professor (teacher) or teacher-in-training to possess sound moral, ethical values and model such behavior. Strategies that have proven to be effective in promoting values acquisition have been teacher modeling, incorporating ethics within the curriculum, and the improvement of academic culture on campus. As Ryan suggested, the curriculum must consist not only of academic content and pedagogical methodology, but also an appreciation by the preservice education student of his or her role as a communicator of community and society values. Goodlad, Soder & Sirotnik (1990) while studying 29 teacher preparation programs found no instances where moral imperatives or ethical responsibilities were incorporated into teacher preparation curriculums.

What a student takes and does with classroom information differs from individual to individual because of prior experience, capabilities, friendships, predisposition and the all important teacher relationship. Even if we are successful in reshaping the student on the surface, unless their soul is touched we will not be able to enter their inner lives. Much contemporary education at the university level seldom does more than touch the surface. The authors suggest that students look to their professors not only for instruction, but values. Therefore, it is important that professors of teacher education model values that society considers important. Although it is undoubtedly true that student values are acquired mostly outside the formal university setting, professors should understand that their responsibilities do not end with presenting the formal curriculum. They must model in word and deed those values expected of those who teach our nation's treasure – our children, our future.

References

Beck, L. G. (1994). Reclaiming educational administration as a caring profession. New York: Teachers College Press.

Escobar-Ortloff, L.M. (1999). Differences in Social and Moral Hierarchical Values Among Colombian and American Preservice Teacher Education Students and Professors. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, MS.

Fincher, J. (1980). Values education: A summing up and a forcast. New directions for higher education, 33 (88), 81-88.

Giggs, L., & Earley, E. (1994). Using children's literature to develop core values. Phi Delta Kappa Fastback (Whole No. 361).

Goodlad, J., Soder, R., & Sirotnik, K. (1990). The moral dimensions of teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lickona, T. (1992). Educating for character: How our schools can teach respect and responsibility. New York: Bantam.

Lickona, T. (1993). The return of character education. Educational Leadership, 51, 6-11.

McBee, m. L. (1980). The values development dilemma. New Directions for Higher Education, 31 (8), 1-7.

Purpel, D. & Ryan, K. (Eds.). (1976). Moral education. Berkeley: McCutchan.

Rokeach, M. (1973). The nature of human values. New York: Collier Macmillan.

Ryan, K. (1988). Teacher education and moral education. Journal of Teacher Education, 39 (5), 18-23.

Shannon, G. J. (1980-1981). Values transmission: some issues and an idea. Interchange, 2, 39-55.

Titus, D. (1997). Balancing unity and diversity: A pedagogy of the American creed. Phoenix: American Association of Colleges for Teacher education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 410211).